

REMARKS

Applicant replies to the Office Action dated July 7, 2006 within the shortened three-month statutory period for reply. Claims 1-6 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-6. Applicant adds new dependent claims 7-13. Support for the new claims and amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these new claims and amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Champagne et al., U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0086199 (“Champagne”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Champagne generally discloses a data transfer system, wherein data residing in a first database may be mapped to fields in a second disparate database. Specifically, the Champagne system is limited to a program that automatically creates a field map defining how data should be moved and translated prior to being transmitted between a first database residing on a remote computing device and a database residing at a host. Champagne discloses a specific field identification protocol that provides a syntax for describing the characteristics of a database field (Champagne, paragraph 35). Specifically, the field identification protocol is limited to providing information identifying a category for the field and information identifying a property of the field.

Essentially, Champagne generally describes a database synchronization process. However, the disclosed synchronization process only ensures that the data fields between two or more databases are mapped correctly. Those of ordinary skill would appreciate that “data” is a very broad term encompassing many types of information and originating through any number of means. Champagne is not concerned with the generation of data, in that it is of no consequence to the data mapping system as to how the data originated. In other words, Champagne is not concerned with the compilation, distribution, completion, and processing of specific forms in order to capture a specific and accurate data set in the context of a specific scenario. As such, Champagne does not disclose or suggest at least, “compiling a subset of said plurality of host forms based on a service type selection,” as recited by independent claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1. As such, dependent claims 2-4 are differentiated from the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champagne in further view of Boothby et al., U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0049764 (“Boothby”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Boothby generally discloses a database synchronization system. Specifically, the Boothby system is limited to enabling a database residing on a first computing device to be synchronized with a database on a second computing device by providing a history file which is stored at each computing device. The history file is updated whenever data within a local database has been added, modified, or deleted. Thus, when the two devices are connected via a network, the history files indicate which database records need to be updated in each device.

As argued in reference to Champagne, Boothby is directed toward a system for ensuring that data residing in two or more databases remain synchronized. Boothby is not concerned with the compilation, distribution, completion, and processing of specific forms in order to capture an accurate data set in the context of a specific scenario. As such, neither Champagne, Boothby, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least, “compiling a subset of said plurality of host forms based on a service type selection,” as recited by independent claim 1 from which claim 5 depends. Moreover, Applicant asserts that claim 5 is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.


The Examiner rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champagne in further view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0049751 (“Chen”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Chen discloses a system and method for managing contact information within a contact management program. The Chen system enables a user to access his or her personal profile and update information within the profile. The system then searches the contact lists of all participating users to determine which lists include contact information relating to the modified profile. If the user who modified their profile is included in one or more contact lists, then the Chen system automatically updates the relevant contact lists with data from the modified user

profile. Chen discloses user interaction with a computer user interface in order to create, modify, and view personal contact information. However, Chen is silent as to the compilation, distribution, completion, and processing of specific forms in order to capture an accurate data set in the context of a specific scenario. As such, neither Champagne, Chen, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least, "compiling a subset of said plurality of host forms based on a service type selection," as recited by independent claim 1 from which claim 6 depends. Moreover, Applicant asserts that claim 6 is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims properly set forth that which Applicant regards as his invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicant authorizes and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814.

Respectfully submitted,


Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

Dated: September 20, 2006

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com